

A
E
.7

A REPLY
TO
PROFESSOR ROBERTSON SMITH:

INCLUDING
A VINDICATION OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY,
A CRITIQUE ON "THE NEWER CRITICISM,"

AND SOME IMPORTANT HINTS ON
THE INTEGRATION OF BIBLE TRUTH,
THE MYSTERY OF THE DIVINE NAMES, AND OF
THE ELOHISTIC AND JEHOVISTIC STYLES
OF SACRED SCRIPTURE.

BY THE
REV. P. MELVILLE, A.M., B.D.,
Minister of St. Columba Church, Hopewell, Nova Scotia.



Halifax:
Nova Scotia Printing Company.
1882.

AR
B12
.M49

CONTENTS.

Introduction and Division of the Argument	1
---	---

ARTICLE I.—OUR PROTESTANT FAITH.

Astounding Theories of Professor Smith stated and tested	2
(1) The Spiritual Interpretation of Scripture Vindicated	2
(2) Not fully understood even by the Prophets	3
(3) Never the mere Natural or Private Interpretation ...	3
(4) Bible Criticism embraces both the Natural and the Spiritual	4
To separate the Divine from the human side is fatal	4
Sceptical Critics fail when tried by facts	5
Professor Smith's talents and virtues recognized	5

ARTICLE II.—THE HEBREW BIBLE CANON.

Causes of Prof. Robertson Smith's difficulties	6
(1) The Hebrew Bible almost extirpated by Epiphanes ...	6
Divine Providence pledged for its preservation	7
(2) Transmitted almost without variation since the Apostolic age	7
Samaritan Text, Septuagint, and Book of Jubilees tested : Results	7
(3) Authorship of the Hebrew Scriptures investigated ...	8
Prof. Smith's great argument on Jeremiah 27 tested	8
Also on 1 Samuel 17 : The Twofold style of Scripture	9
Portentous omens which Rationalism cannot explain	9
The Armageddon battlefield prepared	9
Ludicrous fluctuations and inconsistencies of Rationalism	10
True Solution of the Elohist and Jehovist problem	10

ARTICLE III.—THE INTEGRATION OF BIBLE TRUTH.

Outlines for every devout reader to fill up	11
(1) The Moral Law : Its fundamental pre-eminence	11
The Civil and Ritual Laws all depend on the Moral	11
Israel would not learn that all these point to Christ	11
(2) The Prophets, Earlier and Later, classified	12
True Solution of the Decadence of the Levitical Law	12
Restoration of Patriarchal Judges like Melchizedec and Abraham	12
Yet the constant failure of the Levitic System was not at all in vain	12
(3) The Psalms and Closing Annals confirm this view	13
Errors of Scribes and Expounders should be corrected	13
Ludicrous inconsistencies of Sceptical Criticism	13
The Bible harmonious with itself, and Nature and Deity	13
God's "two witnesses," Grace and Truth, everywhere in its twofold style	13
(4) The Mystery of "Jehovah the Only Saviour"	14
Begun in the First Gospel Promise : applied by Eve to her firstborn	14
Not understood by Abraham but explained to Moses	14
Venerated as Ineffable : its pronunciation lost and changed	15
Revealed to Hebrews and Greeks at last in JESUS CHRIST	15
Explained by the Saviour and His Apostles in the New Testament	15
Valedictory notes and closing suggestions	16

REPLY TO PROFESSOR ROBERTSON SMITH.

BY THE REV. P. MELVILLE, A.M., B. D., ST. COLUMBA CHURCH, HOPEWELL, N. S.

It is a pleasing task to meet manfully, the latest and best arguments of a really intelligent, sincere, and able thinker, although he be an adversary to our dearest ideas and hopes. When our faith and hope are sure and safe for all eternity, we may well be frank and brave. And even if there be danger on some points, we are but poor moralists, as well as poor heroes, if we are not able and willing to risk our ALL on the triumph of TRUTH, and to look the very strongest opposition full in the face,

“ With that stern joy which warriors feel
In foemen worthy of their steel.”

I have very carefully and minutely studied Prof. W. Robertson Smith's twelve lectures on “The Old Testament in the Jewish Church;” and, though honoring and loving the man and the thinker, I have detected some fundamental errors in his theory, which should be corrected at once. I refer not now to slight slips on the surface, but to false principles in the very basis of his theory, which affect the very foundations of faith; and which are, therefore, of a fundamental and fatal tendency.

Had I sufficient space and time, it would be most easy to take the Lectures in their printed order. But to condense the correction of twelve able lectures into two or three short newspaper articles, I shall review them in more Logical order, as follows: (1) Our Protestant Faith; (2) The Canon of Scripture, and its History; and (3) The Law, the Prophets, the Psalms, and the Annals.

The theme is intensely interesting; and though I make no pretence to infallibility, like the would be “*Omniscient Critics*,” yet I have good ground of trust that the clear and simple truth of my argument will win the heart and mind of truth-lovers, not only in our dear native land, with its youthful colleges, but far and near throughout the world; while I try (1) to correct the fundamental errors referred to, (2) to solve the principal difficulties of Bible Criticisms, and (3) to indicate briefly the true Integrative Theory of Scripture Revelation.

ARTICLE I. OUR PROTESTANT FAITH.

Under this head I shall correct the following fundamental errors of Prof. Smith's theory.

1. He condemns the spiritual interpretation of Scripture, which he calls "*Tropical Exegesis*," or Figurative Explanation.

2. He holds that the inspired writers *perfectly understood* as well as perfectly recorded what God spoke to them.

3. He holds that the real meaning of the Bible must be its *natural meaning*.

4. He holds that the *whole business* of scholarly criticism lies with the *human side* of Scripture; and that it must be examined by the ordinary laws of evidence *just like any other ancient book*.

These principles are so astoundingly erroneous, that I have gone over the lectures again and again to see if any other meaning could be got out of them. In correcting them I shall quote Prof. Smith's own words, to prevent any misrepresentation of his views.

1. Early in his first lecture, speaking of the Allegorical or Spiritual Interpretation of Scripture, he says: "This is nothing else than the method of Tropical Exegesis, that reigned supreme in the Old Catholic and Mediæval Church. The ancient fathers laid down the principle that everything in Scripture which, taken in its natural sense, appears unedifying, must be made edifying by some method of typical or figurative application. In principle this is no longer admitted in the Protestant Churches, except perhaps for the Song of Solomon."

Now is this so? Have we, Protestants, in principle rejected the spiritual interpretation of Scripture? I never thought so. Our Church, at least, has not done so. Any Church which does so, will have to reject the method and doctrine of not only the Primitive Church with all its Christian Fathers, but also the method and doctrine of the Apostles and Prophets themselves, and their divine Lord! Witness the Epistle to the Hebrews; the General and Pauline Epistles, in every page; the Gospels with manifold "fulfillings" of old types and new parables; the Law with all its symbolic sacrifices and "shadows of good things to come;" the tabernacle and temples with their patterns divinely foreshown; the Prophets with symbolic visions and voices, which they "heard but understood not;" and the crowning Revelation, full of sublime symbols and allegories, whose only "Temple is the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb!"

And yet are we as Protestants shut out from seeking the spiritual interpretation of these symbols and these mysteries? I trow not? Else what do you say of "Solomon's Temple spiritualized," by Bunyan, and the vast Puritan literature of its kind; with all the Hebrew names they gave to their homes, and their wanderings, and their children; not to speak of the ever growing host of sermons and poems and volumes on Scripture symbolism, now more abundant and more edifying than ever before? Read Knox's First Book of Discipline, chap. I, Exp. 1.

Nay! "The Bible is the religion of Protestants." "The Word of

God
the o
pure
spirit
there
man
receiv
the I
verse
doctr
what
are t
Scrip
profit
it is k
2.
write
perfec
N
"I ha
the ex
are ch
us th
Spirit
of Ch
that n
into v
So to
Now
It
that t
Scrip
menta
they
3.
whole
realiz
progr
Th
Prof.
early
states
ing o
H
proph
and t
in a

God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify Him." The whole Bible, pure and entire, is our Protestant faith. But the whole Bible has a spirit and life as well as a letter, 2 Cor. 3 : 6, and John 6 : 63. We therefore receive it not only in its *letter or natural sense*, as the natural man receives it, but also in its *spirit and life*, as the natural man will not receive it, 1 Cor. 2 : 14. Now this spirit and life of Scripture is just the Lord himself, the Divine Living Word, 2 Cor. 3 : 6 compared with verses 17 and 18, and with John 1 : 1, &c. The true and Scripture doctrine is, that "the testimony of Jesus is the *spirit* of prophecy," whatever its letter may be, Rev. 19 : 10. We therefore as Protestants are taught to seek and find the Lord as the spirit and life of every Scripture; since "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable," 2 Tim 3: 16. If in any Scripture we do not find the Lord, it is because we have not reached its spirit and life at all.

2. Prof. Smith says further on in his first lecture: "The inspired writers were so led by the spirit, that they perfectly understood, and perfectly recorded every word which God spoke to their hearts."

Now how utterly different is this from the testimony of Daniel 12 : 8 : "I heard, but I *understood not* ; then said I, Oh my Lord, what shall be the end of these things? And he said, Go thy way Daniel ; for the words are *closed up and sealed* till the time of the end." So also St. Peter tells us that the very prophets enquired and searched dilligently "what the Spirit of Christ in them did signify, when it foretold the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed that not unto themselves but unto us they did minister those things . . . into which things the very angels desire to look," (1 Peter 1 : 11, 12). So too St. Paul declares, "Now we see through a glass *darkly* . . . Now I *know in part*," (1 Cor 13 : 12).

It is hardly necessary to say more on this point, except to remark that the reiterated notion of Prof. Smith, that the true way to understand Scripture is, *to take it just as its first writers understood it*, is fundamentally wrong. Rather, we should seek to understand it far better than they could. Rom. 16 : 25, 26, Eph. 3 : 5, 6, and 2 Cor. 3 throughout.

3. Prof. Smith says, further on, that the Church must try to get the whole meaning of every inspired writer by taking his book as a whole, realizing his position "and following out in its minutest detail the progress of his thought."

This is capable of a good and true sense, which we would fain hope Prof. Smith intends ; until the context, and especially his words in the early part of his second lecture, force us to think otherwise. There he states as "the great discovery of the Reformation," that "the real meaning of the Bible must *just be its natural meaning*."

How diametrically opposite to the inspired words of St. Peter : No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation," (2 Peter 1 : 20) : and to the inspired words of St. Paul : "We speak the wisdom of God in a *mystery* . . . But the natural man receiveth not the things of

the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him ; neither can he know them, for *they are spiritually discerned*." (1 Cor. 2 : 7, 14). Also to the words of our Saviour : "Unto you it is given *to know the mysteries* of the kingdom of heaven, but unto them it is not given," (Mat. 13, all). We seek not merely the *natural* but the *spiritual* meaning ; not merely the thoughts of the *writer*, but of the Divine *Author* of Scripture, "whose thoughts are higher than man's, as heaven is higher than earth," (Isa. 55 : 9) We seek not merely the words of the prophet, but "*the word of the Lord through the prophet*;" not the letter merely, but also the spirit and the life, namely the Living Word, our Saviour!

4. Toward the end of the first lecture Prof. Smith says, in italics : "*The whole business of scholarly exegesis lies with this human side*" of Scripture. Further on he argues that we must apply the ordinary laws of evidence to the Bible "just as we should do to any other ancient book."

Does scholarship then shut its eyes to the divine side of Scripture? Or have its eyes never been opened to see the wonders of God's law and the mysteries of His Kingdom?

The Lord's Scholars at least have their eyes opened and their understandings enlightened to understand the Scriptures (Luke 24 : 45), for His Scribes are instructed in His Kingdom to bring out ever new truths as well as old, (Mat. 13 : 52), for His Spirit in them searches even the deep things of God (1 Cor. 2 : 10), and they do not put away the key of knowledge (Luke 11 : 52), nor hide it (Acts 4 : 20).

No doubt we should search the Scriptures and examine them with our best wisdom ; but surely not by divorcing the Divine side, and criticising the poor human side alone! By this means you may obtain a private interpretation for every prophecy ; but it will NEVER be the true one ! "No prophecy of the Scriptures is of any private interpretation," (2 Peter 1 : 20). You have merely reached the private occasion of its formal delivery ; but its interpretation is ever spiritual and Divine, saying with still small voice in conscience, "he that hath an ear let him hear what the SPIRIT saith unto the Churches:" not, "what the Jew said to some ancient person or people."

And how can you do justice to the Bible if it has a divine side like no other book, and yet you shut out that side from exegesis, and try it by its human side alone, like ANY other book? This is insanity. Common sense would say "If the Bible has a Divine side, let it have a fair trial, at the very least! It is a mockery of justice to exclude that UNIQUE element from scholarly exegesis and judge the book by its human side alone, just like *any* other old book!" That is like Caiaphas, ignoring the Saviour's divinity, and judging him like any other agitator! To take the "human side" of Scripture apart from its "divine side," is spiritually to take the clothing off the Saviour and part it among the hostile sects which crucify him afresh! If you separate the spirit from the letter, you will kill it ; and you may do as you please with the garments after you have slain your Lord! But He dieth no more. You only

guard
your
The
Rati
lectu
found
system
we fi
and
P
nothi
and l
say, 'A
Asser
Omni
I
as to
of the
nation
at his
they
secret
them
the ru
of us
apair
again
dread
preter
Th
while
the m
is to
my w
that
anoth
of Se
of the
many
feel s
expla
lovers
Sourc

To
espec
dawn

murder His image and remnant in yourself, and sin suicidally against your own soul!

These errors are plainly fundamental and fatal. They are diluted Rationalism. They open out wide and wider in Prof. Smith's earlier lectures, and run through them all as a gaping cleft, yawning from foundation to summit of his theory, and foreboding the fall of his whole system. We trust he will live to repent and correct them; but alas! we fear many may perish by them before that hopeful time shall come and long after it too!

Prof. Smith remarks: "A book that is really old and valuable, has nothing to fear from the critics." Ha! Say you so, in a world of sinners and blunderers eager to get quit of the Bible? Much rather might he say, "a really valuable Professor has nothing to fear from the General Assembly." The clergy are not much less infallible than the would-be Omniscient Sceptical Critics!

I once knew a Professor who pretended to be so great a judge of style as to be able to tell how many authors had a hand in writing the books of the Bible, and to point out the very verses written by each, and the nations and climates they came from. Some of us were really alarmed at his bearing and his boldness, lest he should rob them of the little faith they had left. But the happy thought occurred to us to try him by secretly exchanging our essays and rewriting them by the hands that gave them to him for examination. Well: the great Critic never detected the ruse: and we had a laugh among ourselves you may be sure, as one of us cried out; "*Uve! Uve! He did na ken his ain stoddents styles apairt, frae a' londs, an' yet he kens a' the styles o' twa thoosand years agane! He'll never mak a heretic o' me!*" Since then, we have never dreaded the "Omniscient Critics." We now look upon them as impudent pretenders, or radical blunderers.

Thus far I have given the Bible view of our Protestant Theology, while correcting the opposite Rationalistic errors. I have not dwelt on the many good gifts of Prof. Smith, because the far more needful work is to remove the dire delusions that have seduced so clear a mind! If my words are severe, it is with the severity of love: and my prayer is that God will give him perfect light, and overrule all this for good! In another article I hope to solve his principal difficulties as to the Canon of Scripture and its history; including the intensely interesting problems of the Hebrew text, and the alleged Jehovistic and Elohist editors. To many, this hope may seem incredible. But already I see so clearly and feel so dearly the far-reaching power and the immense results of a few explanatory facts, that I have a quiet and steadfast trust, that very many lovers of truth will soon rejoice in their light and adore their Divine Source.

ARTICLE II.—THE BIBLE CANON.

To answer the anxious inquiries of a sincere soul is a perfect pleasure; especially when the inquirer is meek, modest, and quick to perceive each dawning truth presented. And even if he be perverse and positive, or

dull and despondent, still pity prompts to solve his doubts and difficulties, and to share a dear delight in his deliverance.

Prof. Smith seems sharp as a lynx in detecting difficulties and "magnifying molehills into mountains," but too often blind as a mole to their solution, even when it stares him in the face and while he is stumbling over it. This will appear as we go on. Most of his difficulties arise from his peculiar views of Sacred Scripture, Bible Criticism, and Protestant Theology. They would soon be solved if he could but realize the following truths:

1. God's Word has in its every text and every sentence a human element and a divine element united.

2. Bible Criticism should embrace both in its exegesis, and seek the newness of the spirit in the oldness of the letter.

3. Protestant Theology studies Scripture in its own light, spiritual as well as natural; and not merely in the dubious light of Catholic dogma, or in the sombre shades of skeptical Rationalism.

Prof. Green, of Princeton has so conclusively shown that the historical objections to the "Middle Books of the Pentateuch" are futile and fanciful, that we shall proceed at once to solve the principal objections which remain; namely those regarding the standard Hebrew Text of the Bible, its transmission and its authorship; including the famous problem of the alleged Jehovistic and Elohist writers.

(1). THE STANDARD HEBREW TEXT.

Near the middle of his third lecture, Prof. Smith asserts that there were many and great variations of text in different copies of the Old Testament some centuries before Christ came in the flesh; but that all the varying copies of the Hebrew text disappear about that time. So that we have but one standard text since the first Christian century. He therefore charges the Jewish scribes with deliberately suppressing all the varying copies, as the Caliph Othman destroyed every Koran that differed from his favorite copy. Prof. Smith says positively: "There can be no question who were the instruments in this work. The scribes alone possessed the necessary influence to give one text or one standard MS. a position of such supreme authority." Also, "There is no other explanation which will account for the facts."

Now is this so? Not at all! There was quite another power both able and willing to suppress and destroy Hebrew Bibles. And he did so to his uttermost! History is plain and positive, that Antiochus Epiphanes, King of Syria and Palestine, B. C. 168, utterly massacred the men of Jerusalem and destroyed all copies of the Hebrew Bible he could find in his dominions, under penalty of death!

Surely this is enough to account for the disappearance of many varying copies, without laying the blame on the poor Jewish Scribes, who perished in heaps in temple and city, trying to save their Bibles, even to the very direst deaths, on the sad sabbath of their massacre!

Is it not most astonishing that Prof. Smith did not see this even while

he wa
"An
the o
offend
rigidl
Law
burnt
shoul
B
migh
Heav
6, an

P
the B
copies
400 A
centu
there
centu

1.
most
as M
prove
furth
the a
W
Testa
Old.
N
not s

1.
erate
temp
witne

2.
Phila
about
and a
king
rules
gave
they
and
heath
fore

he was stumbling over it in the close of this very lecture! There he says, "Antiochus Epiphanes caused all copies of the Law, and seemingly of the other sacred books, to be torn up and burnt, and made it a capital offence to possess a Pentateuch." If we take his own words literally and rigidly (as he so often treats the Hebrew scribes) not one copy of the Law escaped, to keep up even one standard text! He says ALL were burnt! Such a glaring double blunder on so very important a question should be remembered as the "standard error."

But although not a sparrow can fall without God's providence, yet might not all trusty copies of God's Word have perished then? Never! Heaven and earth must perish first! Mat. 5 : 18, and 24 : 35 ; Isa. 40 : 6, and 55 : 11.

(2). TRANSMISSION OF THE HEBREW CANON.

Prof. Smith also observes in his third lecture that we have no MS. of the Hebrew text much older than one thousand years, and that all the copies agree so well as to be essentially one text, the same as Jerome used 400 A.D., and indeed the same as the Jewish Rabbins used in the first centuries A.D. But he brings forward three witnesses to prove that there were many various readings, additions and omissions, some centuries B.C. Let us see what this amounts to.

1. That by genuine MSS. it can be proved that the Jews have been most scrupulously correct scribes for the last thousand years; viz., as far as MSS. can go. 2. By Jerome, the Targumists, Aquila, &c., we can prove the unvarying accuracy of the scribes for seven or eight centuries further back; viz., as far as those witnesses can go; even to the verge of the apostles' days!

Well: Is not that delightful? The Christian scribes of the New Testament must yield the palm of victory to the Jewish scribes of the Old.

Now let us examine the three witnesses which say the scribes were not so careful some centuries before the Incarnation.

1. The Samaritan Pentateuch, B.C. 430, is well known to be deliberately corrupted in order to make Mount Gerizim the site of the temple. Surely a scribe who could do THAT, is not to be trusted! This witness therefore fails and goes out of court.

2. The Greek Septuagint translation was made by order of Ptolemy Philadelphus, an Egyptian King who wished to have a great library, about 280 B.C. The Seventy interpreters did their work very roughly, and added a lot of apocryphal books, to enlarge the volume. As their king desired it for recreation, not for salvation, it is probable he laid down rules for them, very different from those which our own King James gave to his translators. Indeed their work shows that on the one hand they wished to preserve many old Hebrew tales and songs and proverbs, and on the other to modify or hide some esoteric doctrines from the heathen king and people, as Jerome also declares. This witness therefore is also unreliable.

3. The Book of Jubilees remains, by some unknown author, of very uncertain date, and still more uncertain transmission. Who can tell how often it has been redacted or interpolated? It varies often from the Hebrew text, but so does Josephus, and so he often intended to do, as we can trace his motives in many cases. This witness is the least reliable of all the three. Josephus and Philo are immensely preferable.

Such witnesses are merely as the dust of the balance, when weighed against the Hebrew Bible, preserved with such amazing scrupulosity since the days of the apostles, and as far back as evidence can go. They simply prove that in the dim past when books were few, some scholars copied the Bible for themselves very imperfectly, and added other little songs and stories to their private copies and Gentile translations. Surely this was to be expected, and by no means can it discredit the standard text of the sanctuary.

People will examine such witnesses for amusement; but sane people will scarcely dream of changing the Hebrew Canon to suit them, or to suit the Koran either!

In his fourth lecture Prof. Smith quotes some difficult passages in Samuel, to show the Septuagint text as preferable. Now, is not this rather odd, since it is an established rule of criticism that "the more difficult reading is *a priori* the more probable?"

(3). AUTHORSHIP OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

In the latter part of his fourth lecture Prof. Smith urges the theory of several authors or editors modelling or remodelling the same book in Scripture. He refers to Isaiah for instance, whose book the critics have so often sawn asunder at the beginning of chapter 40, ascribing the parts to two prophets, as Manasseh sawed Isaiah himself asunder. It is due to Prof. Smith to say that he speaks modestly and reverently in this matter, and does not pretend to be wise above what is written.

But his strongest argument for editorial redaction is based on the extraordinary variation of readings between the Hebrew and the Septuagint text of Jeremiah 27th chapter. Hence he very triumphantly argues, near the end of Lecture 4, that the additions in the Hebrew are the "spurious insertions of a thoughtless copyist," making the whole prophecy absurd and false; since the brazen pillars, &c., could not be carried unbroken to Babylon or back again, with the other vessels of the temple.

To this I reply that the Hebrew text does *not* say that they were to be carried to Babylon *unbroken*, nor does it say that "ALL" the vessels were to be brought back. This is a mere figment of the Professor himself, *who DID put in the word "ALL" in the memorable "standard error,"* above, where it really was absurd and false, though innocently so. But Jeremiah's words are general and so neither false nor absurd.

But Prof. Smith makes a still greater oversight on this very passage. Why can he not notice what is staring him in the face? There was indeed a recension of Jeremiah's prophecy, and afterwards a redaction too; but both the editor and the redactor were Jeremiah himself, though

Baruc
4 and
verse
The
Zedel
32, a
havin
sanct
intern

In
the C
well
offens
ritual
also a
offer
shoul
eyed

In
vario
espec
togeth
Who
old J
in the
old p
of the
go do
have

Th
It wa
interv
throu
throu
their
and I
critic
forms
unhu
Revel
sneer
like t

It
desub
their
hand
Fo
guess

author, of very
Who can tell
often from the
ended to do, as
the least reliable
variable.

when weighed
ing scrupulosity
can go. They
some scholars
ded other little
ations. Surely
it the standard

out sane people
omit them, or to

ult passages in
s not this rather
e more difficult

ES.

arges the theory
e same book in
the critics have
ribing the parts
der. It is due
erently in this
ritten.

s based on the
and the Septua-
aphantly argues,
Hebrew are the
king the whole
l, could not be
er vessels of the

that they were
ALL" the vessels

Professor him-
standard error,"
cently so. But
urd.

is very passage.
ce? There was
ards a redaction
himself, though

Barnes wrote it at his dictation. Read Jeremiah 36th chapter, verses 2, 4 and 9, for the recension or copying; verse 23 for its destruction, and verses 28 and 32 for the later redaction with "many like words added." The next verse (37 : 1) seems to show that this redaction was made in Zedekiah's reign; and we read of still later recensions. Compare Jer. 36 : 32, and 37 : 1, with 28 : 1, and 30 : 1, &c. Of course the *perfect* copy having the "many like words added," would be preserved for the sanctuary; as we find it is. And the Septuagint copy being brief and interrupted, shows that they got some of the unfinished copies to translate!

In like manner the Septuagint changes the order of the chapters against the Gentiles; but the text of Jer. 25 : 17 corrects this. So too we may well excuse the Seventy for omitting Jer. 33 : 14-26, as improbable or offensive to Ptolemy, since Prof. Smith can see nothing in it but Jewish ritual or Romish mass! What then does 1 Peter 2 : 5 mean: "Ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ?" Why should a Christian scholar be lynx-eyed for natural difficulties, but mole-eyed to spiritual interpretation?

In the early part of his fifth lecture Prof. Smith thinks he detects various authors in the same book of Scripture. But in 1 Sam 17, especially, he is haunted by the old vision of *two authors blending* together their narratives and styles, most unreasonably as he thinks. Who are they? He has often seen the like before. Can they be the old Jehovist and the old Elohist who stick together like Siamese twins in the most ancient records of Genesis? Obviously they seem the same old personages, or else their ghosts! Prof. Smith would like to put one of them down, as the Septuagint has done. Still the Hebrew will not go down, but gravely rebukes him, saying, like David to Eliab: "What have I now done? Is there not a cause?"

The Critics stand aghast! They know of no sufficient cause or reason. It was bad enough to find the Jehovist and the Elohist so unaccountably interwoven in Genesis; worse still to find them inexplicably combined throughout all the Pentateuch; still more distressing to find them united through the book of Joshua; and even dreadful to find them or else their apparitions reappearing through the Judges and Samuel, the Kings and Psalms and Prophets. But a still greater horror awaits the sceptical critics when (like Macbeth) they must behold these sage yet childlike forms (which they thought they had killed long ago) seated at table, unhurt, through all the New Testament as well, even to the close of the Revelation! They have stood every fiery trial; and already the sceptical sneer becomes a cry: "Lo! I see four men loose; and the fourth is like the Son of God!"

It is high time now, therefore, to turn from the guerilla warfare of desultory criticism and hasten to this great and decisive battlefield, where their bad cause must win or die! Already they behold the direful handwriting on the wall, which none of them can read!

For many years Rationalism has been constantly fluctuating in futile guesswork on this theme; ever changing its theory like Paris fashions

(from which city the discovery is wrongly dated.) Once, the Elohist in Gen. 1 was considered an Antediluvian, from whom Moses copied, among others, *mosaically*. Anon, Deuteronomy was held to be *far too modern* for the other books of the Pentateuch. Next, it is declared *the most ancient*, except some fragments in Genesis and Exodus; and "the middle books" are held *more modern* by far. Then it is seen that the Elohist lives far too long for one man, and so they divide him into two Elohist. But now they discover that the Jehovist is the older, and that he lives all through the Bible; and they do not know what to make of THAT BOOK!

This just proves that God's Word cannot be analyzed and judged or criticised like a merely human book. It confounds its critics and makes diviners mad!

Prof. Smith, about the middle of his eleventh lecture, says on this theme: "It is impossible that the work of one author could so divide itself into two narratives, and have for each a different name of God."

This would indeed be true of mere human authors, but it is not impossible with God as author, BUT ACTUALLY NECESSARY! For cannot Prof. Smith see what stares him in the face, that God's names are *significant*, expressing His attributes and relations to His creatures? Hence when he addresses persons in some certain relation to Him, He uses such a Divine Name as suits that relation best. But when He addresses persons in a different relation to Him, He uses another Divine Name most appropriate to this different relation. Thus, in every case, *the significant name or title in suitable relation to the persons addressed* becomes the germ of a corresponding style, and determines the form of the language, in all its expressions, in perfect and infallible order. For everything Divine is in infinitely perfect order, and His words are not arbitrarily combined like man's, but being living and everlasting (1 Peter 1:23-25) they are evolved from infinite wisdom, so that each idea is born of other ideas so perfectly as to make a continuous style exactly suited to the relation involved.

Now God has two very conspicuous relations to man: (1) As the Almighty Creator and Judge, he is called *Elohim*, the God of universal nature: (2) As the Eternal and Infinite Love, he is called *Jehovah*, the Covenant God of all grace and salvation.

Hence He is called *Elohim* in Gen. 1, as the Great First Cause; but *Jehovah Elohim* in Gen. 2 after the first sabbath "made for man," when He entered into covenant with man. The Serpent and Eve call Him *Elohim*, while they break the first covenant; But He comes again as *Jehovah Elohim*, to make the Covenant of Promise. Bad Critics may object much to this truth; as bad scholars think they find many mistakes in their school books. But the Divine MASTER'S Book will always prevail in the end; and the bad Critics and bad scholars will only expose themselves as usual.

What then? Just this:—The Critics have proved what they tried to deny; viz., the twofold style of the Bible is not man's style but the LORD'S, as God of nature and spirit, or Truth and Grace. These are

His e
amon
all th
whoe

"
of the
reader
can fi
most
ment,
on su
have
consid
the P

Th
and s
wheth
in the
our Sa
that i
earth
delive
by its
the co
eterna

Th
also g
the fa
sacrifi
so RE
CHRIS
they
suprer
Cor. 3
and re
31 and
Penta
ally"
Lamed
Divin
we qu

ce, the Elohist
Moses copied,
d to be *far too*
is declared *the*
us; and "the
s seen that the
e him into two
older, and that
hat to make of

and judged or
critics and makes

are, says on this
could so divide
ame of God."

s, but it is not
y! For cannot
God's names are
His creatures?

on to Him, He
But when He
s another Divine
, in every case,
persons addressed
nes the form of
ible order. For
s words are not
rlasting (1 Peter
hat each idea is
us style exactly

an: (1) As the
God of universal
ed *Jehovah*, the

First Cause; but
for man," when
d Eve call Him
comes again as
Bad Critics may
d many mistakes
ook will always
will only expose

what they tried
s style but the
race. These are

His essential characteristics: For "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, full of GRACE and TRUTH." These are His "two witnesses" all through the Bible, proving irrefragably that He is its one Author, whoever its writers may or may not have been!

ARTICLE III.—BIBLE INTEGRATION.

"To the wise a hint is sufficient." Such trust have I in the evidency of the truths I state, and in the sagacity of my attentive truth-loving readers, that I have given little else than hints and outlines, which they can fill up, expand, and corroborate at leisure. This will be to them a most sweet and sacred study, replete with richest instruction and improvement, mentally and spiritually, throughout life. Without wasting words on such trifling objections as any wise Christian can easily answer, I have solved only the principal difficulties set forth. And now we shall consider briefly the true view of the Bible in its Integrity, as the Law, the Prophets, the Psalms, and the Annals.

I. THE LAW, GIVEN BY MOSES.

The Moral Law of the Decalogue or Ten Commandments, is the centre and supporting pillar of all the Laws and Revelations given to Israel, whether civil, ritual, or otherwise. In Deuteronomy it is summed up in the two great commandments of Love to God and man, on which, as our Saviour taught, all the Law and the Prophets hang. He also taught that it is for all men through all ages, and imperishable as heaven and earth in its every jot and tittle. Its preeminence is shown by its delivery by God's own voice from Sinai, in thunder and in flame, and by its inscription by God's finger on the tables of stone, for the ark of the covenant in the holy of holies: signifying the very principles of eternal holiness in the heart of Christ. (Ps. 40 : 8).

The civil and ritual laws for Israel as a nation and a Church, were also given by Moses; though some of them were old traditions from the fathers; such as circumcision and sacrifice. God did not INSTITUTE sacrifice by Moses, but PERMITTED it as a patriarchal institution, and SO REGULATED it as to be "a shadow of good things to come," typifying CHRIST and His Kingdom. But Israel was so spiritually blind that they would not perceive the good things foreshadowed, nor even the supreme End of the whole Law, which is Christ, (Rom. 10 : 4; and 2 Cor. 3 : 14.) They idolized the ritual *letter*, but despised its moral *spirit*, and rejected its Divine *life*. God warned them oft, (as in Deut. 29, 30, 31 and 32 ch.) but they would not learn. Besides these laws, the whole Pentateuch is often called "The Law," in which Moses has inlaid "mosaically" many passages from older seers and sages, as Adam and Cain, Lamech and Noah, Abraham and Melchizedek, &c. But we find the Divine style and spirit in the whole, and knowing God to be the Author, we quibble not about the spokesmen or scribes.

II. THE PROPHETS, EARLIER AND LATER.

In the Hebrew Bible, the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, are called "Early Prophets;" while Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor books, are called "Later Prophets." Daniel, too, is called a prophet by our Saviour. Moses himself, and Joshua, with Samuel and other Judges and Kings, were prophets, besides their kingly office.

Even the sceptical critics confess that Joshua corroborates the Pentateuch. To silence this witness, therefore, they join his book with the Pentateuch into a "Hexateuch," and impeach all the six, by trying to set the witness of the later books against them, chiefly in this, that the Levitical Laws seem to be neglected or unknown in their time.

Is it not amazing that those critics cannot see that this was the very fate foretold by Moses to rebellious Israel, Lev. 26, Deut. 29-32, &c.? And the books of Joshua and his successors record how it came to pass (Joshua 24 : 31, Judges 2 : 6-13); Israel had utterly broken the Mosaic covenant after the death of Joshua and his elders. The service of the tabernacle at Shiloh was dying out into a profane sham, till neither people nor priests knew the Lord, (Judges 2 : 10, and 1 Sam. 2 : 12). The Levitical system failed, and its priesthood was changed, necessitating a change of Law, (Heb. 7 : 11, 12). From that time its ritual is generally in abeyance, and the patriarchal order of Judges returns (Judges 2 : 28) with its patriarchal priesthood, "after the order of Melchizedek," the Prophet, Priest and "King of Justice and Peace" (Ps. 110 : 4). This at once explains and removes almost all the historical objections. The Ark of God was taken captive, and never returned to the tabernacle at Shiloh, but was privately secluded from Eli's death till David's days; in type of our Saviour's sojourn and rejection. Now to say that the Levitical books are therefore of later origin, is as absurd as to say that the New Testament was invented since the American War, because the Churches tolerated "war," and "lawsuits," as well as "laying up treasure on earth," and having "two coats."

With the above explanation let any man examine the book of Judges verse by verse and chapter after chapter, and he will be surprised to find how perfectly it confirms the books of Moses and Joshua by continual incidents and allusions. So also do the books of Ruth and Samuel, the Kings and the Prophets, the Psalms and the Annals throughout. They all agree with Isaiah that moral obedience is far better than ritual sacrifice, which becomes vain and disgusting without the former. They all agree with Jeremiah that the Levitical Law, was made in vain for Israel if they use it like a "den of robbers" into which they can escape from duty and justice (Jer. 7 all, and 8 : 8). David, Solomon, Hezekiah, and Josiah, tried indeed to restore the Mosaic ritual, in a modified form, with one temple and ark, typifying one Mediator by whom we can come to God. But their efforts were inwardly failures, for Israel's heart was far from God. Then came their captivity as Moses foretold. Afterwards Ezra, Nehemiah, &c., tried to establish the entire Mosaic Law among the returned exiles, in all its literality and iron

rigidit
percei
spiritu
"no
Jerusa
11 ; 2

All
Israel
with C
ritual
bear.
bringi
(Ps. 9
In
Nehen
strivin
the Ge
the glo
God of

Ev
some e
be igno
"an in
graspin
genuin
by mis
or as if
ment ;
wrote c
speak c
the for
Divine
as if ev

But
The se
them n
in a H
in an E
Psalms
Then t
and w
dread
Author
Jehova
Truth
or in t

rigidity. But still it seemed a piteous failure; for Israel would not perceive the spirit and end of the Law, but only its letter and vail. Yet spiritually it was not a failure. For thus God's Word was written, "not for themselves but for us," to be the jasper wall of the New Jerusalem for ever and ever. (1 Peter 1 : 12 ; Rom. 15 : 4 ; 1 Cor. 10 : 11 ; 2 Peter 1 : 20, 21 ; Rev. 21 : 12-14, and Eph. 2 : 20).

III. THE PSALMS AND THE LATER ANNALS.

robbrates the join his book all the six, by chiefly in this, in their time. s was the very ut. 29-32, &c.? t came to pass ken the Mosaic service of the m, till neither 1 Sam. 2 : 12). d, necessitating s ritual is gen- returns (Judges f Melchizedek," (Ps. 110 : 4). rical objections. o the tabernacle l David's days ; o say that the as to say that ar, because the ying up treasure

In the closing annals of Scripture, the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah present a piteous picture of Israel under the legal yoke, striving among themselves within, struggling against the Samaritans and the Gentiles without, fighting against fate, yet dreading to write or speak the glorious name of JEHOVAH in which is all their help and hope, as the God of salvation !

Every book of the Bible is thus found to confirm the rest, despite some errors of scribes and some mistakes of expounders, which should not be ignored. But is it not ludicrous to see the same Critics who reject as "*an interpolation*" every text that crosses their theory, yet greedily grasping at every straw of doubt or difficulty, with no doubt of its genuineness ! As if some explanatory note might not get into the text by mistake of some copyist ; or as if no "Dan" existed but Jacob's son ; or as if Jordan itself were not named after an earlier "Dan" or "judgment," or as if Moses himself were not "King in Jeshurun" while he wrote of the earlier Dukes and Kings of Edom ; or as if no Jew could speak of himself in the third person, although they constantly did so by the forms "thy servant" and "my lord ;" as also Moses did, and his Divine Saviour too who habitually calls Himself "the Son of Man ;" or as if every ANCIENT PARABLE must be a DEAD LITERALISM !

But the Bible properly understood is supremely true and consistent. The sceptics may impeach Moses and Joshua as a Hexateuch, but it avails them nothing. On the same principle they must impeach Judges too, in a Heptateuch ; then add Samuel, in an Octateuch ; then add Kings in an Enneateuch ; then the later Prophets in a Dekateuch ; then the Psalms in a Hendekateuch ; then the closing annals in a Dodekateuch ! Then they must do likewise with every book of the New Testament ; and what then ? Why, they will have proved the very thing they dread most of all ! namely, that the whole Bible has one Spirit and one Author, whoever its writers may be ; and that the twofold style of Jehovah Elohim is nothing else than the eternal marriage of Grace and Truth in the Living Word, whether revealed in "the Word made flesh" or in the Word spoken and written unto the fathers by the prophets !

With utmost reverence, then, let us turn to this most mysterious Name. We have seen that JEHOVAH is the memorial name of God in covenant with man as "the God of Salvation," viz., the Divine Saviour. He declares: "I even I am JEHOVAH, and besides Me there is no SAVIOUR." (Isa. 43 : 11.) The mystery of God and His Revelation is hidden in this name; and here we may now seek and find it, so far as we are able to receive it. (Rev. 10 : 7.) What then is the true meaning of that most awful Name? and what is its history?

IV. JEHOVAH THE ONLY SAVIOUR (Isa 43 : 11).

Among the learned it is well known that the name JEHOVAH is from the third person singular in the future of a most ancient form of the Hebrew substantive verb "to be." It properly signifies "He will be;" but as a noun or name, "He who will be"; or "He that is to come." As the Hebrew has no distinct present tense, it also signifies, "He that is" (I AM) and "He that was," as well, for "Out of nothing nought SHALL COME." Psalm 90 : 2.

Just after the fall of Adam and Eve, the Almighty promised a Seed of the woman to bruise the Serpent's head and suffer in His heel (Gen. 3 : 15). It is one Seed only, for the pronoun is in the singular masculine. By believing the Promise of this "Coming Man" Eve escaped the death of the fall and became "the mother of all living." This promise appears recorded in the most ancient astrology (when the stars were used for memorials and books, Gen. 15 : 5), in the constellation of the Virgin bearing a handful of corn, with the brightest star "Spica" as the Seed; also in Ophiuchus bruising the serpent and treading down the scorpion which turns to wound his heel! This promise appears as the secret motive of the intense desire for offspring among the ancients. That Eve understood God's promise in this way is shown by her words about her first born son: "I have gotten a man, even Jehovah," (Gen. 4 : 1), viz., "He that is to be." She appears evidently to regard him as "the Seed," viz., the Saviour already born to crush the Serpent. The Greek, Latin, and English translators put in the word "from," but it is not in the original. Eve soon found out her mistake, and in despair of a mere human seed she called her next son Abel or "vanity." Afterwards, in the third generation, men began to pray to God as JEHOVAH, viz., "the coming Saviour," the Divine Seed! (Gen. 4 : 25). But again Noah is thought to be the Seed to comfort man and remove the curse of the Fall. (Gen. 5 : 29). The promise was at length renewed to Abraham that in his Seed all nations shall be blessed (Gen. 22 : 18). St. Paul truly declares that this Seed is CHRIST (Gal. 3 : 16).

I know the sceptical objection that God was not known to Abraham by his name JEHOVAH (Ex. 6 : 3). But if they could read the Hebrew, they would see that the word "known" there means "understood" or "perceived" as in Isaiah 6 : 9. Thus also we read that Eli's sons knew not Jehovah (1 Sam. 2 : 12). In this way truly very few know JEHOVAH (*Divine love*) to this day, but only EL SHADDAI (*Almighty power*) as all their liturgies indicate. Do the men of the Iron Age "know the Lord,"

the Sa
"God
J
and sp
"I ha
Obser
bruising
Afterw
14) as
very m
Heb. l
manifi
Bu
16 : A
and so
Elohim
form o
all the
come)
Saviour
9 : 6, 1
David's
Mal. 3
Micah
the tru
restored
Baptist
says : '
and Et
Not w
alike in
and H
the Je
murder
sworn
He is
of Jeh
Alpha
and wh
"Jesus
"For i
He cla
and 16
hath se
human
ascende
with us
Imman

most mysterious
name of God in
Divine Saviour.
There is no
Revelation is
and it, so far as
the true mean-

11).

JEHOVAH is from
ent form of the
"He will be ;"
that is to come."
ifies, "He that
nothing nought

promised a Seed
His heel (Gen. 3 :
angular masculine.
escaped the death
promise appears
s were used for
n of the Virgin
a" as the Seed ;
wn the scorpion
the secret motive
ents. That Eve
words about her
(Gen. 4 : 1), viz.,
n as "the Seed,"
The Greek, Latin,
ot in the original.
a mere human
wards, in the third
viz., "the coming
oah is thought to
e Fall. (Gen. 5 :
that in his Seed
uly declares that

own to Abraham
ead the Hebrew,
"understood" or
at Eli's sons knew
ew know JEHOVAH
ghty power) as all
"know the Lord,"

the Saviour, while they (with Herbert Spencer) honour only an *unknown*
"God of Forces!" (Daniel 11 : 38).

Jacob prophesied of the coming Saviour as Shiloh of the tribe of Judah, and speaking of Dan as a serpent biting the heels of the horse, exclaims : "I have waited for thy salvation, O Jehovah!" (Gen. 49 : 10, 18.) Observe the association of ideas, viz., Jehovah "the Seed of the woman" bruising the Serpent's head, though Dan and Jacob too are "heel takers." Afterwards the name of Jehovah was made very plain to Moses (Ex. 3 : 14) as "I will be who I will be," viz. : the Word made flesh. This very name Christ claims repeatedly (John 8 : 58 ; Rev. 1 : 8, 11, 18 ; Heb. 13 : 8). This is plainly the memorial name of God about to be manifest in flesh as the Divine Humanity, the Godman !

But from such awful warnings as Ex. 20 : 7 ; Lev. 24 : 16 ; Ps. 50 : 16 ; Amos 6 : 10, Israel dreaded to write this dearest Memorial Name ; and so its vowels were lost and forgotten, and the vowels of Adonai or Elohim used instead. So that our best scholars believe that the original form of the name was YEHVEH, or YAHVEH ! But He declares : "As I live all the earth shall be filled with the glory of Jehovah," (Him that is to come) Numb. 14 : 21. Again in Isa. 45 : 21, 22 Jehovah is the only Saviour. In Jer. 23 : 6, He is "Jehovah our Righteousness." In Isa. 9 : 6, He is a child born, yet the Everlasting Father ; in Ps. 110 : 1, David's Lord yet his Son ; in Hag. 2 : 7, the Desire of all nations ; in Mal. 3 : 1, and 4 : 2, He is Jehovah, the Sun of Righteousness ; in Micah 5 : 2, the Ruler in Israel . . . yet from everlasting. When the true meaning of His memorial name was lost in Hebrew, it was restored in Greek as "Ho Erchomenos," "He that shall come." John Baptist asks, "Art thou He that should come?" The Samaritan woman says : "I know that Messiah cometh." John calls Him "the true God and Eternal Life ;" Jude calls Him "the only wise God our Saviour." Not without Divine Providence is His name translated. "The Lord," alike in the Old Testament and the New, in Greek, Latin, and English, and He quoted it so (Mat. 22 : 44). This is the mystery of God which the Jewish priests could never understand nor answer ; and yet they murdered our Saviour for revealing it (Mat. 26 : 63-66). But God hath sworn that every knee shall bow to Jesus, and every tongue confess that He is Lord (Isa. 45 : 21-25, with Phil. 2 : 9-11). He claims the name of Jehovah who "inhabiteth eternity," and he explains it thus : "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty" (Rev. 1 : 8, 11, 18). "Jesus Christ the same yesterday and to-day and forever" (Heb. 13 : 8). "For in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. 2 : 9). He claims to be JEHOVAH ELOHIM of the holy prophets (Rev. 22 : 6, and 16). He says "I and my Father are one," "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (John 10 : 30, and 14 : 9). Even in His humble humanity He was still in heaven (John 3 : 13). And now though ascended far above all heavens (which cannot contain Him) He is still with us, filling all in all (Eph. 4 : 10, and 1 : 23). As the virgin born Immanuel, He now treads on the old Serpent's head according to the

primeval promise ; and He is predestined by eternal decree to put all enemies under His feet and to destroy death and devil too ! (1 Cor. 15 : 25, 26, and Heb. 2 : 14), and to save to the uttermost all who come to God in Him, the only Way, the Truth, and the Life ! Still always "JEHOVAH," he is ever "coming" more and more into man's consciousness, by his Infinite Originality ! His last word to us is, "Surely I come quickly." And to them that look for Him He will come the second time without sin unto salvation" (Heb. 9 : 28).

This intensely interesting theme is discussed by Mr. Weeks in his recent treatise on "Jehovah Jesus;" and by Mr. McWhorter in his excellent book on "Yahveh Christ." Let our students and our thinkers read such able works ; and above all let us study God's own Word in its original languages and its original purity !

VALEDICTORY NOTES.

And now it is hard to say Adieu ! Although urgent duties call me away and incessant study demands repose, yet so sacred, so absorbing, so entrancing, has this study grown to me that we cannot part. Many who will read these papers with ease, can little dream of the intense study, day and night, which has made their lessons easy for all time to come ! But who that loves this ecstatic study, even though its exhausting toil may wear him away, will not say after all, "If this be called dying, 'tis pleasant to die !" The Bible infinitely repays the intensest study of men and angels. Its field contains such Divine pearls of great and priceless worth, that we may well consent to *sell out* all of self and selfishness, and invest in that good field. "Into these things the angels desire to look ;" and all wise men will do the same. Many things I have indicated so briefly as to be but seed-thoughts to those who can judge their value and sow and reap their harvests. Doubtless some things are left obscure, by brevity ; and hence bad critics will cavil and object, as bad scholars think they find many errors in their school books. But the Divine Book will always prevail in the end, and bad critics like bad scholars will only expose themselves as usual. Many new truths are only beginning to dawn upon us, with entrancing light and glory. Thus, even where the Scriptures seem broken and interrupted, we often notice such a beautiful and more than philosophical connection inwardly and spiritually, that we cannot doubt Whose wisdom has made it so. Thus in Scripture as in Nature there is no real "Chance" or mere accident. Think of the surprise and dismay of the profane Wits when they perceive this fact ! Is not this a manifest sign of CHRIST'S PRESENCE AND APPEARING in the Cloudy Pillar of His Word ? "Behold He cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see Him."

Let our young churches and colleges, with all our young people and our old, unite in the ancient Bible prayer of faith, love and new obedience : "Open Thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy Law !"

P. MELVILLE.

File-Tex
Single Copy Pamphlet Cover

Grade V

Made in all Sizes

McMILLAN OFFICE APPLIANCES COMPANY

Wentworth, Ont., Canada.

**Manufacturers of Office and Library Filing Supplies
Special List Services and Specialties**